



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,380	12/23/2005	Claus Gschiermeister	6741P089	1914
8791	7590	07/07/2010		
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP			EXAMINER	
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY				VERDI, KIMBLEANN C
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2194	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/07/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/562,380	GSCHIERMEISTER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KimbleAnn Verdi	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2010.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 April 2010 and 14 November 2007 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-28 are pending in the current application.
2. **Claims 14-27** are directed to computer system comprising: an agent executed by the computer system. In view of Applicant's disclosure, specification page 11, paragraph 67, lines 3-27, the Examiner interprets the limitation of an agent to be a program stored in a non-transitory machine-readable storage medium which is executed by a processor, the machine-readable storage medium is limited to only non-transitory tangible storage medium embodiments. Therefore claims 14-27 are directed to statutory subject matter.

Specification

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: claim 28 refers to a non-transitory machine accessible medium, however the specification does not disclose a machine accessible medium. For purposes of examination the meaning of "The non-transitory machine accessible medium" is interpreted as a non-transitory machine readable storage medium as described in Applicant's specification paragraph [0067] lines 1-5. Examiner suggests amending the claim as follows: -***A non-transitory machine readable storage medium having instructions stored therein, the instructions when executed by a processor cause the machine to-***.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 1-28 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a. Claim 1, line 10, the recitation of "notifying an application about the if the change is relevant ", should be –notifying an application about the change if the change is relevant--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

13. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

14. **Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.**

5. **Claim 1** is directed to a process (method), however, the process does not pass the machine-or-transformation test since the particular machine is present in a step that is only insignificant “extra-solution” activity, as such the claims are not directed to statutory subject matter.

6. In contrast, a process claim which explicitly recites the particular machine or apparatus, recites a step that inherently involves the use of a particular machine or apparatus, or particularly transforms a particular article to a different state or thing, and the use of the particular machine or the transformation of the particular article involves

significant activity that is central to the purpose of the method, is therefore directed to statutory subject matter.

7. The limitation of checking, by an agent executed by a computer system, a plurality of entries representative of a plurality of applications maintained by the agent to determine whether the changed data is relevant for each application in the plurality of applications appears to present the use of the particular machine in a step which is only insignificant “extra solution” activity since “checking a plurality of entries representative of a plurality of applications maintained by the agent to determine whether the changed data is relevant for each application in the plurality of applications” is an activity that does not appear to be central to the purpose of the method invented by the applicant.

8. Examiner suggests amending the claim limitations of requesting changed data, notifying an application, and transmitting the relevant changed data to include the limitation of an agent since “upon each receipt of the notification, requesting, ***by an agent executing in a computer system***, changed data from the data object”, “notifying, ***by the agent***, an application about the change if the change is relevant for that application”, and “transmitting, ***by the agent***, the relevant changed data to the application” is a process claim with defined structural and functional interrelationships, tied to machine statutory class, and the use of the particular machine involves significant activity that is central to the purpose of the method and therefore directed to statutory subject matter. Appropriate correction or amendment is required.

9. **Claims 2-13** did not cure the deficiencies of claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. **Claims 1, 4-5, 7, 9, 14-15, 18-19, 21, 23, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brodsky et al. (hereinafter Brodsky, previously cited) (U.S. Patent 5,991,536) in view of Chow et al. (hereinafter Chow) (U.S. Patent 6,029,175).**

17. **As to claim 1**, Brodsky teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a computer-implemented method comprising:

receiving a notification regarding a data object (*i.e. “observed object”*)

indicating a change to the data object (*i.e. “Whenever a change is made to a specified observed object in the object hierarchy, the notification manager is informed”, col. 4, lines 49-51;*)

notifying an application (*i.e. “observer object”*) about the change if the change is relevant for that application (*i.e. “notifies the associated observer objects... with information concerning the change”, col. 4, lines 54-57*); and

transmitting the relevant changed data (*i.e. “information concerning the change”*) to the application (*i.e. “The observer objects monitoring the observed object are notified in an unspecified order with information concerning the change”, col. 4, lines 55-57 – an observed object represents the application - and the information concerning the change must contain the changed data since-“The notification manager … invokes a function of the observed object provided by the BaseNotifier class to notify all observer objects registered with the observed object that the attribute A now has the name of “B””, col. 6, lines 36-41).*

18. Brodsky does not explicitly disclose upon each receipt of the notification, requesting changed data from the data object; and checking, by an agent executed by a computer system, a plurality of entries representative of a plurality of applications maintained by the agent to determine whether the changed data is relevant for each application in the plurality of applications.

19. However Chow teaches upon each receipt of the notification (*i.e. “step 451”, Figure 38, “entry point 451 entered when a change notification is received by the Revision Manager from a server such as the file server 313 in FIG. 32, col. 29, lines 21-24*), requesting changed data from the data object (*i.e. “step 459”, Figure 38, “if a search specification is defined for the object, then the object is obtained from the network in step 459 by following the object's search specification. For*

example, the object identification code itself may specify a primary or unique source for the object, and in this case the Revision Manager directs a request over the network to the primary or unique source for the object”, col. 29, lines 50-57); and

checking (i.e. checks the list of clients), by an agent (i.e. "Revision Manager") executed by a computer system, a plurality of entries (i.e. client item in object's interested client list), representative of a plurality of applications maintained by the agent (i.e. “Each item in the client list represents a client browser registering interest in the associated WWW document within the cached document file. The item is a data structure which contains the client's IP address, port number, updating interval, last time of update and a needs-to-be-updated flag”, col. 20, lines 1-6, "The directory of clients 390 includes a list of the clients that are being serviced by the Revision Manager 301, col. 26, lines 27-29), to determine whether the changed data is relevant for each application (i.e. "If the client has a significant change detection method for the object, then execution continues from step 493 to step 494 where the processor of the Revision Manager applies the method to the change in the object to determine whether the change is significant to the client”, col. 31, lines 45-49) in the plurality of applications (i.e. “In step 499, the processor of the Revision Manager checks whether the pointer is at the end of the list of clients interested in the object, and if so, the processor is finished processing the change notification. Otherwise, execution branches from step 499 to step 500, where the pointer is advanced to the next client in the

object's interested client list. From step 500, execution loops back to step 492. In this fashion, all interested clients are notified of significant changes in the object", col. 31, lines 63-67 and col. 32, lines 1-2).

20. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the notification manager of Brodsky with the teachings of Revision Manager from Chow because this feature would have provided a mechanism which operates as an intermediary between a client, such as a browser executed at a user's terminal, and a local or remote network server, to automatically retrieve changed documents previously accessed from network and inter-network servers (***col. 3, lines 60-67 and col. 4, line 1 of Chow***).

21. ***As to claim 4***, Brodsky teaches registering entries of sub-objects (*i.e. subordinate observed objects in object hierarchy- "The object hierarchy 114 includes the observed objects 112", col. 3, line 31, - subordinate observed objects registered with notification manager since the "notification manager maintains a list of observed objects, col. 4, lines 44-45*), a sub-object being a set of data which is changed in dependence on a change of a key data object (*i.e. change to observed object would be cascaded to subordinate observed objects in the object hierarchy since "The object hierarchy 114 includes the observed objects 112, and when a change is made to an observed object 112, generally by the user, this change is reflected in the object hierarchy 114", col. 3, lines 31-34*).

22. **As to claim 5**, Brodsky teaches transmitting the relevant changed sub-object data (*i.e. “information concerning the change”*) to the application after notifying the application (*i.e. “The observer objects monitoring the observed object are notified in an unspecified order with information concerning the change”, col. 4, lines 55-57 – an observed object represents the application - and the information concerning the change must contain the changed data since- “The notification manager ... invokes a function of the observed object provided by the BaseNotifier class to notify all observer objects registered with the observed object that the attribute A now has the name of “B””, col. 6, lines 36-41).*

23. **As to claim 7**, Brodsky teaches filtering out data objects whose changes are not to be communicated to an application (*i.e. “The notification manager... accesses certain status information contained therein, determines which observed objects have been modified, and then notifies the associated observer objects”, col. 4, lines 51-54 – notification manager filters out observed objects that do not have associated observed objects since the notification manager only sends notifications to registered observer objects listed with the observed object– “the observer objects register with the notification manager, so that they are notified when changes or modifications are made to the observed objects”, col. 4, lines 28-30), “where each observed object may have multiple observer objects”, col. 4, lines 45-46*), prior to transmitting the relevant changed data to the application (*i.e. “...and then notifies the associated observer objects”, col. 4, lines 54-55, “The*

observer objects monitoring the observed object are notified in an unspecified order with information concerning the change”, col. 4, lines 55-57).

24. As to claim 9, Brodsky teaches registering the entries of data objects (*i.e. observed objects*) and applications (*i.e. “observer objects”*) in a customization structure of an agent (*i.e. “all knowledge of how to notify the observer objects of changes in the observed objects in the object hierarchy is encapsulated in the notification manager”, col. 4, lines 20-23, – notification manager acts a agent for the observed and observer objects – since “The notification manager acts as an intermediary between the observer object and the object hierarchy”, col. 4, lines 26-27, “the object hierarchy includes the observed objects”, col. 3, lines 31-32).*

25. As to claim 14, this claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 since claim 14 recites the same or equivalent invention, see the rejection to claim 1 above. In addition Brodsky teaches the agent (*i.e. “notification manager”, “all knowledge of how to notify the observer objects of changes in the observed objects in the object hierarchy is encapsulated in the notification manager”, col. 4, lines 20-23, – notification manager acts a agent for the observed and observer objects – since “The notification manager acts as an intermediary between the observer object and the object hierarchy”, col. 4, lines 26-27, “the object hierarchy includes the observed objects”, col. 3, lines 31-32*) to register an entry representative of a data object in a first data structure (*i.e. “notification manager maintains a list of observed*

objects"- *list of observed objects is a first data structure, col. 4, lines 44-45*), to register an entry representative of an application (*i.e. "The observer objects register with the notification manager, so that they are notified when changes or modifications are made to the observed objects in the object hierarchy"*, col. 4, lines 28-31) in a second data structure (*i.e. "notification manager maintains a list of observer objects*"- *list of observer objects is a second data structure, col. 4, lines 44-45*).

26. Brodsky does not explicitly disclose the application entry specifying the data object whose changes are relevant for the application.

27. However Chow teaches the application entry (*i.e. client entry in "directory of clients*") specifying the data object whose changes are relevant for the application (*i.e. "The directory of clients 390 includes a list of the clients that are being serviced by the Revision Manager 301. The data structures further include lists 391 of objects of interest to the clients in the directory of clients 390. Also associated with the clients in the directory 390 are the client's significant change detection methods 392 for the objects of interest. These methods consist of procedures or parameters for predetermined procedures that can compute changes in altered objects and determine which changes are material to the client"*, col. 26, lines 27-37). The motivation for modifying Brodsky with the teachings of Chow is the same as provided in the rejection of claim 1 above.

28. **As to claim 15**, Brodsky teaches wherein the agent is further to:

present a first input interface (i.e. "*Object Composition View 204, Figure 2*", "**views in a graphical user interface (GUI) displayed on a monitor of the computer**, col. 3, lines 64-65) to allow for registering (i.e. **adding**) the entries representative of data objects (i.e. "**observed objects**", "**wherein these views are used to interact with the user in the construction of an object hierarchy or its component parts**", col. 3, lines 66-67 and col. 4, lines 1-2, -**an observed object created in the object hierarchy using a view is added to the list maintained by the notification manager**);

present a second input interface (i.e. "**a user interface object, such as a view or window displayed on a monitor attached to the computer**", col. 3, lines 61-63) to allow for registering the entries representative of applications (i.e. "**observer object**", "**A typical observer object is a user interface object**", col. 3, lines 60-61, which "**register with the notification manager**", col. 4, lines 28-29).

29. **As to claims 18-19**, these claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 4-5 since claims 18-19 recite the same or equivalent invention, see the rejections to claims 4-5 above.

30. **As to claim 21**, this claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 7 since claim 21 recites the same or equivalent invention, see the rejection to claim 7 above.

31. **As to claim 23**, this claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 9 since claim 23 recites the same or equivalent invention, see the rejection to claim 9 above.

32. **As to claim 28**, this claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 14, since claim 28 recites the same or equivalent invention, see the rejection to claims 1 and 14 above.

33. **Claims 6, 8, 13, 20, 22, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brodsky et al. (hereinafter Brodsky, previously cited) (U.S. Patent 5,991,536) in view of Chow et al. (hereinafter Chow) (U.S. Patent 6,029,175), as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of Attwood et al. (hereinafter Attwood, previously cited) (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0015441 A1).**

34. **As to claim 6**, Brodsky as modified by Chow does not explicitly disclose wherein specifying data objects whose changes are relevant for the respective application comprises: receiving a list of fields whose changes are relevant for the respective application.

35. However Attwood teaches wherein specifying data objects whose changes are relevant for the respective application comprises: receiving a list of fields (*i.e. “set of objectIDs”, paragraph [0075]*) whose changes are relevant for the respective

application (*an application will “register interest in specific objects”, paragraph [0068], lines 1-3*).

36. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified the notification manager of Brodsky as modified by Chow with the teachings of notification system from Attwood because this feature would have further provided a mechanism which enables software applications to register interest in the actions performed on data objects, to notify other software applications of actions performed, and to receive notification events of the actions performed by other software applications which have a registered interest in common data objects (*paragraph [0003], lines 8-13 of Attwood*).

37. **As to claim 8**, Brodsky as modified by Chow does not explicitly disclose wherein registering entries representative of applications includes: specifying which changes of a data object are relevant for the application.

38. However Attwood teaches wherein registering entries representative of applications includes: specifying which changes (i.e. “set of actions”, paragraph [0076]) of a data object are relevant for the application (*an application will “register interest in specific objects and the actions performed”, paragraph [0068], lines 1-3*). The motivation for modifying Brodsky with the teachings of Chow and Attwood is the same as provided in the rejection of claim 6 above.

39. **As to claim 13**, Brodsky as modified by Chow does not explicitly disclose wherein a data object represents one of location, location-product, and transportation lane in context of a business application.

40. However Attwood teaches wherein a data object represents one of location (*i.e. “Destination” – is a data type for a data object defining – “the address or location of a machine, Table 1*), location-product, and transportation lane in context of a business application (*i.e. “medical application”, “a set of related medical applications distributed across a hospital network may register interest in changes to all patients or a specific set of patients so that up to date patient information is always available to and used by all software applications of the hospital”, paragraph [0005], lines 4-9*). The motivation for modifying Brodsky with the teachings of Chow and Attwood is the same as provided in the rejection of claim 6 above.

41. **As to claim 20**, this claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 6 since claim 20 recites the same or equivalent invention, see the rejection to claim 6 above.

42. **As to claim 22**, this claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 8 since claim 22 recites the same or equivalent invention, see the rejection to claim 8 above.

43. **As to claim 27**, this claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 13 since claim 27 recites the same or equivalent invention, see the rejection to claim 13 above.

44. **Claims 2-3, 10-12, 16-17, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brodsky et al. (hereinafter Brodsky, previously cited) (U.S. Patent 5,991,536) in view of Chow et al. (hereinafter Chow) (U.S. Patent 6,029,175), as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of Reed et al. (hereinafter Reed, previously cited) (U.S. Patent 6,044,205).**

45. **As to claim 2**, Brodsky as modified by Chow does not explicitly disclose expecting a confirmation of changes from an application after transmitting the changed data to the application.

46. However Reed teaches expecting a confirmation of changes (*i.e. “receipt acknowledgement message return”, “a receipt method assigned by a provider is a receipt acknowledgment message return”, col. 37, lines 32-33*) from an application (*i.e. “consumer program” 22, Figure 1*) after transmitting the changed data (*i.e. “communications object update”*) to the application (*i.e. “As shown in FIG. 1, this is a message 33 returned by consumer program 22 to provider program 12 via a communications network 3 available to both provider and consumer. This message acknowledges the consumer's receipt of the communications object or object update.”, col. 37, lines 34-36*).

47. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified observer objects of Brodsky as modified by Chow with the teachings of communications object from Reed because this feature would have further provided a mechanism for updating the transferred information in the consumer computer when the information in provider computer has changed (**col. 6, lines 24-26 of Reed**), and the updated information can be automatically received, processed, stored, and indexed by the consumer program 22 (**col. 28, lines 59-61 of Reed**).

48. **As to claim 3**, Brodsky as modified by Chow does not explicitly disclose triggering a mechanism if an expected conformation is not received.

49. However Reed teaches triggering a mechanism (*i.e. "taking necessary actions"*) if an expected conformation (*i.e. "acknowledgment"*) is not received ("*if the acknowledgment is not received, the method can take other necessary actions, such as retransmitting the response or notifying the consumer via the news report or other notification methods*", **col. 41, lines 64-67**). The motivation for modifying Brodsky with the teachings of Chow and Reed is the same as provided in the rejection of claim 2 above.

50. **As to claim 10**, Brodsky as modified by Attwood does not explicitly disclose wherein an entry for an object comprises: an ID representative of the data object; an ID

representative of the key of the data object; a flag representative of activity; an ID representative of the key structure of the data object; and an ID of the wrapper class.

51. However Reed teaches wherein an entry for an object (*i.e. “Communications Object 110”, Figure 3*), comprises: an ID representative of the data object (*i.e. “Name”, col. 16, lines 62-64, “used as a label for identifying the element”, col. 15, lines 57-58*); an ID representative of the key of the data object (*i.e. “SystemID”, col. 16, lines 62-64, “unique system ID value assigned to each unique communications object...equivalent of an automatically-generated unique key field ID”, col. 18, lines 44-48*); a flag representative of activity (*i.e. “New Flag”, col. 16, lines 62-65, “is set each time an element is changed”, col. 15, lines 60-61*); an ID representative of the key structure of the data object (*i.e. “Description” – description of object normally identifies type and structure, col. 16, lines 62-64*) and an ID of the wrapper class (*i.e. “class attribute”, “class communication object belongs to”, col. 17, line 2*). The motivation for modifying Brodsky with the teachings of Chow and Reed is the same as provided in the rejection of claim 2 above.

52. **As to claim 11**, Brodsky as modified by Attwood does not explicitly disclose wherein an entry for an application comprises: an ID representative of the application; a flag representative of activity; an ID representative of the expected structure of notification.

53. However Reed teaches wherein an entry for an application (*i.e. “Recipient 120”, Figure 3*) comprises: an ID representative of the application (*i.e. “System ID”, “used to uniquely identify recipients”, col. 17, lines 20-22*); a flag representative of activity (“*New Flag*” -attribute shown in Figure 3, “*is set each time an element is changed*”, *col. 15, lines 60-61*); an ID representative of the expected structure of notification (*i.e. “AttachmentType” -attribute shown in Figure 3, “the type of encoding that should be used”, col. 17, lines 25-26*). The motivation for modifying Brodsky with the teachings of Chow and Reed is the same as provided in the rejection of claim 2 above.

54. **As to claim 12**, Brodsky as modified by Attwood does not explicitly disclose wherein an entry for a sub-object comprises: an ID representative of the sub-object; an ID representative of the key data object; an ID representative of the structure of the data object; an ID representative of the object key object.

55. However Reed teaches wherein an entry for a sub-object (*i.e. “Element 142”, Figure 3*) comprises: an ID representative of the sub-object (*i.e. “Name...used as a label for identifying the element”, col. 15, lines 57-58*); an ID representative of the key data object (*i.e. “SystemID ... unique identification number”, col. 15, lines 53-55*); an ID representative of the structure of the data object (*i.e. “Description” – description of object normally identifies type and structure, col. 15, lines 53-54*); an ID representative of the object key object (*i.e. “SystemID” - of Communications*

Object element is assigned to – “element 142... must be assigned to an object 110”, col. 16, lines 58-60 and 62-64, “since each instance of a communications object system ID 110 or any or any component class system ID is unique within the provider's database, the combination of these system IDs creates a canonical naming system capable of uniquely identifying every communications object instance or object component class instance throughout the communications system”, col. 19, lines 5-11). The motivation for modifying Brodsky with the teachings of Chow and Reed is the same as provided in the rejection of claim 2 above.

56. **As to claims 16-17,** these claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 2-3 since claims 16-17 recite the same or equivalent invention, see the rejections to claims 2-3 above.

57. **As to claims 24-26,** these claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 10-12 since claims 24-26 recite the same or equivalent invention, see the rejections to claims 10-12 above.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

58. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

59. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

60. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KimbleAnn Verdi whose telephone number is (571)270-1654. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30am-5:00pm EST..

61. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hyung Sough can be reached on (571) 272-6799799. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2194

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

62. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/H. S. Sough/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2194
07/04/2010

July 3, 2010
KV